UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/822,543	03/30/2001	Basuki Afandi Sugiarto	M-10973 US	7668

27774 7590 09/21/2005

MAYER, FORTKORT & WILLIAMS, PC
251 NORTH AVENUE WEST
2ND FLOOR
WESTFIELD, NJ 07090

EXAMINER	
JUNTIMA, NITTAYA	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2663	

DATE MAILED: 09/21/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/822,543	SUGIARTO, BASUKI AFANDI	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Nittaya Juntima	2663	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *29 June 2005*.

2a)☒ This action is FINAL. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-22* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *13* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-12 and 14-22* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *30 March 2001* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the amendment filed on 6/29/2005.

2. Claim 13 was cancelled as per applicant's amendment.

3. Claims 1-12 and 14-22remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-12, and 14-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rai et al. ("Rai") (USPN 6,421,714 B1) in view of Bahl et al. ("Bahl") (USPN 6,834,341 B1), and further in view of Calhoun (USPN 6,463,475 B1).

Regarding claims 1, 17, 21 and 22, as shown in Fig. 2, Rai teaches a system comprising:

A router (54) coupled to a base station (36), wherein the base station transmits and receives wireless signals to and from the modems coupled to computers (32). See col. 5, ll, 56-col. 6, ll 15.

A switch (router 42) in communication with the router (54) via a communication path, and the router (54) routes signals between the base station (36) and the switch (router 42) via the communication path, the switch (router 42) routes signals between the router (54) and first and second ISPs (two ISPs in 46) via wired communication paths (col. 5, ll, 56-col. 6, ll 29).

Rai fails to teach a tunnel switch and imposing a first and a second predetermined signal bandwidth limits as recited in the claim.

Regarding the router imposing a first and a second predetermined signal bandwidth limits, as shown in Fig. 3A, Bahl teaches the router (110a comprises PANS server 302) imposes a first predetermined signal bandwidth limit between the modems and the first ISP (an ISP of the ISPs in 105), and a second predetermined signal bandwidth limit between the modems and the second ISP (another ISP of the ISPs in 105) in order to accommodate different service levels with different bandwidth limits provided by different ISPs to the subscribed clients ("...components 110 can negotiate, on behalf of the users, with the different ISPs 105 for Internet access...," col. 5, ll 57-67, "..component 110a comprises .. "PANS" server) and a Policy Manager 304," col. 10, ll 11-15,

"..all of a user's Internet data packet traffic (to and from) is routed through the PANS server 302," col. 10, ll 30-32, "The Policy Manager 304 can contain one or more policy tables that define ..network access speeds..," col. 10, ll 40-44, "...PANS server 32 interacts with the Policy Manager 304 to decide which of the client's packets will be allowed passage to the Internet and how they will be scheduled for transmission," col. 10, ll 59-65. See also, col. 16, ll 31-40, 47-50, 64-col. 17, ll 4).

Given the teaching of Bahl, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify the teaching of Rai to incorporate the function of the component 110a, i.e. imposing a first and a second predetermined signal bandwidth limits into the router of Rai as recited in the claim. The suggestion/motivation to do so would have been to provide different service levels for accessing

the Internet/ISPs including different bandwidth allocations to the users as taught by Bahl (col. 5, ll 41-67).

Regarding a tunnel switch, in an analogous architecture, Calhoun teaches using a tunnel switch (100, Fig. 2) to route the traffic to a plurality of destinations (col. 4, ll 8-45).

Given the teaching of Calhoun, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combined teaching of Rai and Bahl to include the tunnel switch, e.g. replacing Rai's switch (router 42, Fig. 2) with Calhoun's tunnel switch, into the combined system of Rai and Bahl as recited in the claim. The suggestion/motivation to do so would have been to implement security access and switch the user traffic to a tunnel destination, e.g. destination ISPs, as taught by Calhoun (Abstract).

Regarding claim 2, Rai does not teach that the router uses a software interface to impose the first and second pre-determined bandwidth limits. However, Bahl teaches that the router (110a) uses a software interface to impose the first and second pre-determined bandwidth limits (col. 10, ll 11-15, 26-44). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to include that the router uses a software interface to impose the first and second pre-determined bandwidth limits. The motivation/suggestion to do so would have been to automatically and systematically implement various functionalities including imposing the bandwidth limits without constant human intervention.

Regarding claims 3 and 4, Rai does not teach that the router uses a hardware interface/a circuit and software interface to impose the first and second pre-determined bandwidth limits.

However, shown in Fig. 3A, Bahl teaches that the router (110a) uses a hardware interface/a circuit and software interface to impose the first and second pre-determined

bandwidth limits since the router (110a) is a physical device which must include a hardware interface/a circuit interface that collectively under control of software components of PANS server 302 and Policy Manager 304 route the user traffic to/from the ISPs 105 according to the subscribed service levels (col. 10, ll 11-44, and further col. 7, ll 7, ll 53-57 and Fig. 2).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify the teaching of Rai to include the router uses a hardware interface/a circuit and software interface to impose the first and second pre-determined bandwidth limits as recited in the claims in order to successfully accommodate the subscribed service levels/bandwidth limits to the user.

Regarding claims 5 and 18, Rai teaches directing signals between the first ISP (one ISP in ISPs 46) and at least one modem (32) and direct signals between the second ISP (another ISP in ISPs 46) and at least modem (32). However, Rai fails to teach the tunnel switch using a first Layer 2 Tunneling Protocol and a second Layer 2 Tunneling Protocol to direct the respective signals.

However, Calhoun teaches the tunnel switch (100, Fig. 2) using a Layer 2 Tunneling Protocol (col. 4, ll 8-45).

Given the teaching of Calhoun, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Rai to include that the tunnel switch using a first Layer 2 Tunneling Protocol and a second Layer 2 Tunneling Protocol as recited in the claim. The suggestion/motivation to do so would have been to implement security access and switch the client traffic to each of the tunnel destinations, e.g. each of the destination ISPs, as taught by Calhoun (Abstract).

Regarding claim 6, Rai further teaches that the signals between the modems (32, Fig. 2) and base station (36, Fig. 2) comprise emails (col. 5, ll 11-15).

Regarding claims 7-10, 19, although Rai teaches that the signals also include WWW contents and streaming media protocols (col. 5, ll 11-17), Rai does not explicitly teach that the signals between the modems (32, Fig. 2) and base station (36, Fig. 2) comprise requests for Internet content, motion pictures and requests for motion pictures, music videos and requests for music videos, video games and requests for video games. An examiner notice is taken that various types of traffic being communicated and available to/from Internet users include requests for Internet content, motion pictures and requests for motion pictures, music videos and requests for music videos, video games and requests for video games. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Rai to include that the signals comprise requests for Internet content, motion pictures and requests for motion pictures, music videos and requests for music videos, video games and requests for video games which can be communicated to/from and available to Internet users.

Regarding claim 11, as shown in Fig. 2, Rai teaches that the modems (32) and the base station (36) must maintain a substantially continuous wireless communication connection (col. 5, ll 56-col. 6, ll 15).

Regarding claim 12, Rai fails to explicitly teach that the communication paths connecting to ISPs 46 in Fig. 2 comprise fiber optic cable. However, an examiner notice is taken that it is well known to use fiber optic cable in network system to provide low data loss, high-speed transmission, and freedom from electromagnetic interference and grounding problems. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify the teaching of Rai to

include the communications that comprise fiber optic cable in order to take advantage of fiber optic cable benefits including low data loss, high-speed transmission, and freedom from electromagnetic interference and grounding problems.

Regarding claim 14, Rai teaches that the modems are integrated with the computers (col. 5, ll 56-67).

Regarding claims 15 and 20, Rai does not teach that the router imposes a first pre-determined signal bandwidth limit between the router and the tunnel switch for the first ISP, and a second pre-determined signal bandwidth limit between the router and the tunnel switch for the second ISP as recited in the claim.

However, as shown in Bahl's Fig. 3A, it is inherent that the component 110a must impose a first predetermined signal bandwidth limit between the component 110a and a Host Organization network 104 for an ISP in ISPs 105, and a second predetermined signal bandwidth limit between component 110a and the a Host Organization network (104) for another ISP in ISPs 105 since different service levels with different bandwidth limits to/from different ISPs are provided to the subscribed clients, col. 5, ll 57-67, col. 10, ll 40-44, and col. 16, ll 31-40.

Given the teaching of Bahl, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combined teaching of Rai and Couhoun (see rejection of claim 1) such that the router imposes a first pre-determined signal bandwidth limit between the router and the tunnel switch for the first ISP, and a second pre-determined signal bandwidth limit between the router and the tunnel switch for the second ISP as recited in the claim. The suggestion/motivation to do so would have been to provide different service levels for accessing the Internet/ISPs with different bandwidth allocations to the users as taught by Bahl (Abstract).

Regarding claim 16, as shown in Fig. 2, Rai teaches a system comprising:

A router (54) coupled to a base station (36), wherein the base station transmits and receives wireless signals to and from the modems coupled to computers (32). See col. 5, ll, 56-col. 6, ll 15.

A switch (router 42) in communication with the router (54) via a communication path, and the router (54) routes signals between the base station (36) and the switch (router 42) via the communication path, the switch (router 42) routes signals between the router (54) and first and second ISPs (two ISPs in 46) via wired communication paths (col. 5, ll, 56-col. 6, ll 29).

However, Rai fails to teach a tunnel switch and imposing a first and a second predetermined signal bandwidth limits as recited in the claim.

Regarding a tunnel switch, in an analogous architecture, Calhoun teaches using a tunnel switch (100, Fig. 2) to route the traffic to a plurality of destinations (col. 4, ll 8-45).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Rai to include a tunnel switch, e.g. replacing Rai's router 42, Fig. 2 with Calhoun's tunnel switch, into the system of Rai as recited in the claim. The suggestion/motivation to do so would have been to implement security access and switch the user traffic to a tunnel destination, e.g. destination ISPs, as taught by Calhoun (Abstract).

Regarding imposing a first and a second predetermined signal bandwidth limits, as shown in Fig. 3A, Bahl teaches the router (110a comprises PANS server 302) imposes a first predetermined signal bandwidth limit between the modems and the first ISP (an ISP of the ISPs in 105), and a second predetermined signal bandwidth limit between the modems and the second ISP (another ISP of the ISPs in 105) in order to accommodate different service levels with

different bandwidth limits provided by different ISPs to the subscribed clients ("...components 110 can negotiate, on behalf of the users, with the different ISPs 105 for Internet access...," col. 5, ll 57-67, "..component 110a comprises .. "PANS" server) and a Policy Manager 304," col. 10, ll 11-15, "..all of a user's Internet data packet traffic (to and from) is routed through the PANS server 302," col. 10, ll 30-32, "The Policy Manager 304 can contain one or more policy tables that define ..network access speeds..," col. 10, ll 40-44, "...PANS server 32 interacts with the Policy Manager 304 to decide which of the client's packets will be allowed passage to the Internet and how they will be scheduled for transmission, " col. 10, ll 59-65. See also, col. 16, ll 31-40, 47-50, 64-col. 17, ll 4).

Given the teaching of Bahl, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify the combined teaching of Rai and Calhoun to incorporate the function of the component 110a, i.e. imposing a first and a second predetermined signal bandwidth limits into the tunnel switch of Rai and Calhoun as recited in the claim. The suggestion/motivation to do so would have been to provide different service levels for accessing the Internet/ISPs including different bandwidth allocations to the users as taught by Bahl (col. 5, ll 41-67).

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed on 6/29/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

A. In the remarks regarding claims 1, 17, 21 and 22, the applicant argued that the combined teaching of Rai, Bahl, and Calhoun fails to teach the limitation "the router imposes a first pre-determined signal bandwidth limit between the modems and the first Internet server provider,

and the router imposes a second pre-determined signal bandwidth limit between the modems and the second Internet service provider.

In response, Rai clearly teaches, as shown in Fig. 2, a router (54) coupled to a base station (36), wherein the base station transmits and receives wireless signals to and from the modems coupled to computers (32) (col. 5, ll, 56-col. 6, ll 15), but fails to teach a tunnel switch and imposing a first and a second predetermined signal bandwidth limits as recited in the claim.

Regarding the router imposing a first and a second predetermined signal bandwidth limits, as shown in Fig. 3A, Bahl teaches that the router (110a comprises PANS server 302) imposes a first predetermined signal bandwidth limit between the modems and the first ISP (an ISP of the ISPs in 105), and a second predetermined signal bandwidth limit between the modems and the second ISP (another ISP of the ISPs in 105) in order to accommodate different service levels with different bandwidth limits provided by different ISPs to the subscribed clients, col. 5, ll 41-67 (emphasis added). "...components 110 can negotiate, on behalf of the users, with the different ISPs 105 for Internet access..." (col. 5, ll 57-67), "..component 110a comprises .. "PANS" server) and a Policy Manager 304" (col. 10, ll 11-15), "..all of a user's Internet data packet traffic (to and from) is routed through the PANS server 302" (col. 10, ll 30-32), "The Policy Manager 304 can contain one or more policy tables that define ..network access speeds.." (col. 10, ll 40-44), "...PANS server 32 interacts with the Policy Manager 304 to decide which of the client's packets will be allowed passage to the Internet and how they will be scheduled for transmission" (col. 10, ll 59-65). See also, col. 16, ll 31-40, 47-50, 64-col. 17, ll 4.

Given the teaching of Bahl, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify the teaching of Rai to incorporate the function of the component 110a, i.e. imposing a first and a

second predetermined signal bandwidth limits into the router of Rai as recited in the claim. The suggestion/motivation to do so would have been to provide different service levels for accessing the Internet/ISPs including different bandwidth allocations to the users as taught by Bahl (col. 5, ll 41-67).

Since there is no structural nor functional difference between the router with the bandwidth imposing function of the combined teaching of Rai and Bahl and the router as recited in the claims, therefore, the combined teaching of Rai and Bahl teaches the router as claimed. Therefore, the rejection is maintained.

B. In the remarks regarding claim 16, the applicant argued that the combined teaching of Rai, Bahl, and Calhoun fails to teach the limitation "the tunnel switch imposes a first pre-determined signal bandwidth limit between the modems and the first Internet server provider, and the router imposes a second pre-determined signal bandwidth limit between the modems and the second Internet service provider.

In response, as shown in Fig. 2, Rai teaches a switch (router 42) in communication with the router (54) via a communication path, and the router (54) routes signals between the base station (36) and the switch (router 42) via the communication path, the switch (router 42) routes signals between the router (54) and first and second ISPs (two ISPs in 46) via wired communication paths (col. 5, ll, 56-col. 6, ll 29), but fails to teach a tunnel switch and imposing a first and a second predetermined signal bandwidth limits as recited in the claim.

Regarding a tunnel switch, in an analogous architecture, Calhoun teaches using a tunnel switch (100, Fig. 2) to route the traffic to a plurality of destinations (col. 4, ll 8-45).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Rai to include a tunnel switch, e.g. replacing Rai's router 42, Fig. 2 with Calhoun's tunnel switch, into the system of Rai as recited in the claim. The suggestion/motivation to do so would have been to implement security access and switch the user traffic to a tunnel destination, e.g. destination ISPs, as taught by Calhoun (Abstract).

Regarding imposing a first and a second predetermined signal bandwidth limits, as shown in Fig. 3A, Bahl teaches the router (110a comprises PANS server 302) imposes a first predetermined signal bandwidth limit between the modems and the first ISP (an ISP of the ISPs in 105), and a second predetermined signal bandwidth limit between the modems and the second ISP (another ISP of the ISPs in 105) in order to accommodate different service levels with different bandwidth limits provided by different ISPs to the subscribed clients, col. 5, ll 41-67 (emphasis added). "...components 110 can negotiate, on behalf of the users, with the different ISPs 105 for Internet access..." (col. 5, ll 57-67), "..component 110a comprises .. "PANS" server) and a Policy Manager 304" (col. 10, ll 11-15), "..all of a user's Internet data packet traffic (to and from) is routed through the PANS server 302" (col. 10, ll 30-32), "The Policy Manager 304 can contain one or more policy tables that define ..network access speeds.." (col. 10, ll 40-44), "...PANS server 32 interacts with the Policy Manager 304 to decide which of the client's packets will be allowed passage to the Internet and how they will be scheduled for transmission" (col. 10, ll 59-65). See also, col. 16, ll 31-40, 47-50, 64-col. 17, ll 4.

Given the teaching of Bahl, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify the combined teaching of Rai and Calhoun to incorporate the function of the component 110a, i.e. imposing a first and a second predetermined signal bandwidth limits into the tunnel switch of

Rai and Calhoun as recited in the claim. The suggestion/motivation to do so would have been to provide different service levels for accessing the Internet/ISPs including different bandwidth allocations to the users as taught by Bahl (col. 5, ll 41-67).

Since there is no structural nor functional difference between (a) the tunnel switch with the bandwidth imposing function of the combined teaching of Rai, Calhoun, and Bahl and (b) the router as recited in the claims, therefore, the combined teaching of Rai, Calhoun, and Bahl teaches the tunnel switch with the bandwidth imposing function as claimed. The rejection is sustained.

C. In response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).

D. In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988)and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, since Bahl teaches that "components 110 can negotiate, on behalf of the users, with

the different ISPs 105 for Internet access..the users are given choices as to different levels of service that they can be provided. The levels of service..can include diffiferent bandwith allocations, security measures, and ISPs" (col. 5, ll 41-67), therefore, the suggestion/motivation to combine the teaching of Bahl into Rai or the combination of Rai and Calhoun would have been to provide different service levels for accessing the Internet/ISPs including different bandwidth allocations to the users as taught by Bahl (col. 5, ll 41-67).

E. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Conclusion

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nittaya Juntima whose telephone number is 571-272-3120. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 8:00 A.M - 5:00 P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ricky Ngo can be reached on 571-272-3139. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Nittaya Juntima
September 16, 2005

RICKY NGO
PRIMARY EXAMINER
9/15/05